

**RI AIRPORT SYSTEM PLAN
CHANGES TO SEPTEMBER 28, 2007 DRAFT**

- p. 2-2 Fourth paragraph: Change FAA Airport “Development Corporation” to “Improvement Program”
- p. 2-15 OQU table: change 2005 Operations from 18,846 to 15,333
- p. 2-17 UUU table: change 2005 Operations from 18,823 to 18,699
- p. 2-20 WST table: change 2005 Operations from 21,307 to 16,206
- p. 2-22 BID table: change 2005 Operations from 18,631 to 12,794
- p. 2-28 Change title of table to “Regional Airport Data”
- p. 2-29 Change title of table to “Regional Airport Facilities Data”
- p. 3-3 Two bar charts combined. Footnote added.
- p. 3-5 Footnote added.
- p. 3-11 Added PVD 2005 GA Operations.
- p. 3-18 Extended line graph to 2005 and deleted table. Footnote added.
- p. 3-20 Extended bar chart to 2005 and deleted table. Footnote added.
- p. 3-29 Line 1: Changed “invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan” to “Global War on Terrorism”; deleted “deep” in reference to recession
- p. 3-36 Line 9: Added after traffic base “In more developed areas of the Northeast, however, even the alternative airports can be physically constrained.”
- p. 3-40 Last bullet: Insert “penalty” after payload.
- p. 5-5 Updated maps to include Las Vegas as existing destination.
- p. 5-6 Line 6: Changed “nonstop service to the West Coast” to “nonstop long-haul service”.
- p. 7-6 First line in table: change “Evaluate in AMPU” to “Recently evaluated in AMPU and not recommended at this time.”

p. 7-10 Delete final paragraph and insert the following:

Summary

On one hand this chapter should be helpful to provide a relative estimate of the timing and costs to improve the infrastructure for each airport in the system at this point in time. On the other hand it should be apparent to the reader that the information is not entirely complete. As forecasts react to industry dynamics and the economy, as new master planning and project engineering is completed, and as estimates are refined, the implementation schedule will need to be revisited.

It is clear to assume that the costs of the GA system improvements can reasonably range from \$40 to \$50 million. However, a quick review of Figure 640-07(7) draws attention to T.F. Green Airport and the absence of estimated costs for improvements. The total is so highly dependent on the completion of the EIS (selection of the preferred runway alternative) and the FAA Record of Decision that it is too speculative to provide a reasonable cost estimate at this time. What is clear is that it will “dwarf” the cost of improving the rest of the system over the next 20 years. The cost of financing the improvements for T.F. Green will in part have an implication on the ability to finance the GA system. These decisions will ultimately be determined by in depth financial planning and capital improvement plans that are necessary to issue bonds. This is all done in coordination with financial institutions and FAA.

Even as this State Guide Plan Element is completed, the planning for airport improvements is going to be significantly impacted by new legislation being debated in Congress. The proposed legislation will create an aviation trust fund (revenue) and airport grant program (financing). Hopefully it will be passed in 2008. The provisions could change the level of funding and how FAA allocates monies to states and airports. At the same time drawing considerable attention are the current concerns by the public on airport delays and the airlines’ handling of the travelers’ issues.

In summary, the completion of the EIS process and the outcome of the new federal legislation will be primary factors in how RIAC will approach future financial needs for the RI/ASP.